

Application No. 10/668,170  
Amendment Dated October 31, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 31, 2006

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8-11, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent publication number 2002/0178003 to Gehrke et al. (“Gehrke”) in view of U.S. patent number 6,289,226 to Lekven et al. (“Lekven”). Claims 4-7 and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehrke in view of Lekven and further in view of U.S. patent publication number 2003/0139171 to Kuita (“Kuita”).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to distinguish the invention from the combination of Gehrke and Lekven. Applicant believes that claim 1 is now patentable over the combination of Gehrke and Lekven. As amended, claim 1 now requires that the telephone number includes a word command that assists in formatting the telephone number. This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested in either Gehrke or Lekven.

As discussed in paragraph [070] of the specification, the spoken word “pause” may be included in a number string entered into the system to indicate the end of a number string. The system then formats the numbers preceding the word “pause” according to the formatting rules of the system. Further, in paragraphs [079] and [080], using the pauses to indicate the inclusion of a separation character in a number string is taught. Therefore, this amendment is supported by the specification and does not add new matter.

Including a word command in the telephone number string to assist in formatting the telephone number is neither disclosed nor taught by either Gehrke or Lekven. Gehrke teaches a voice recognition system, including a training module, but does not discuss formatting either numbers or words for display on a GUI. Regarding Lekven, the system in Lekven is capable of changing states only upon receiving a valid numeric digit, as discussed in col. 5, lines 6-29, and col. 5, line 61 to col. 6, line 1. Further, if the entered information, either words or digits, in the Lekven system do not correspond to a known telephone number, Lekven applies no formatting. Col. 6, lines 18-20. In other words, Lekven is capable of formatting only a string of digits which corresponds to a

Application No. 10/668,170  
Amendment Dated October 31, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 31, 2006

known telephone number from a calling plan, as stored in the memory of the Lekven system. Col. 6, lines 35-38. Neither Gehrke nor Lekven discusses the formatting of a mixed string of numeric digits and words.

Therefore, claim 1 as amended is now patentable over the combination of Gehrke in view of Lekven. As claims 2, 3, 8, and 9 depend from claim 1, these claims include all of the limitations of the independent claim and are also patentable over the combination of Gehrke in view of Lekven.

Claims 4-7 also depend from claim 1 and include all of the limitations of the independent claim, and are also patentable over the combination of Gehrke in view of Lekven. The additional cited reference, Kuita, does not overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Gehrke in view of Lekven in teaching that a second format be applied to a non-telephone number. Therefore, claims 4-7 are also patentable over the cited combination of Gehrke in view of Lekven and further in view of Kuita.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 10 as unpatentable over the cited combination of Gehrke in view of Lekven. Claim 10 as originally presented includes the limitation that a second format be applied to a non-telephone number. Applicant believes that this limitation is not taught by either Gehrke or Lekven.

In the Office Action, for example on page 3, the Examiner states that Lekven teaches that a second format is used to format a non-telephone number, and directs the Applicant to Lekven, col. 8, line 66 through col. 9, line 20. However, this cited passage teaches only that one of a plurality of different telephone number formats may be selected for the input telephone numbers. Lekven does not teach in the cited passage or anywhere in the disclosure that a format is to be applied to a non-telephone number.

In contrast to the suggestion that Lekven teaches formatting non-telephone numbers with second format, Lekven in fact teaches away from applying a format to non-telephone numbers. Lekven teaches that applying formatting to a non-telephone number would prove to be confusing, so no format is to be applied to non-telephone numbers. See, Lekven, col. 6, lines 18-20 and lines 37-40, and col. 7, lines 15-28.

For these reasons, the combination of Gehrke and Lekven fails to teach at least this limitation. Therefore, independent claim 10 as originally filed is patentable over the combination of Gehrke and Lekven. Further, as claims 11 and 15 depend from claim 10, these claims include all of the limitations of the independent claim and are also patentable over the combination of Gehrke and Lekven.

Claims 12-14 also depend from claim 10 and include all of the limitations of the independent claim, and are also patentable over the combination of Gehrke and Lekven. The additional cited reference, Kuita, does not overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Gehrke and Lekven, in that Kuita also fails to teach that a second format be applied to a non-telephone number. Therefore, claims 12-14 are also patentable.

Claims 16, 17, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent publication number 2003/0064748 to Stulberger (“Stulberger”) in view of Lekven. Claims 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stulberger in view of Lekven and further in view of Kuita. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 16 includes the limitation that the HFT system applies a first format to a first type of information and a second format to a second type of information. As discussed above, Lekven teaches only that a first format is applied to a telephone number and teaches away from formatting a second type of information. Stulberger does not overcome the deficiencies of the teachings of Lekven, as Stulberger also does not teach formatting two types of information in different manners. Therefore, claim 16 as originally presented is patentable over the combination of Stulberger in view of Lekven.

As claims 17 and 20 depend from claim 16, these claims include all of the limitations of the independent claim and are also patentable over the combination of Stulberger in view of Lekven.

Further, claims 18 and 19 also depend from claim 16 and include all of the limitations of the independent claim, and are also patentable over the combination of

Application No. 10/668,170  
Amendment Dated October 31, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 31, 2006

Stulberger in view of Lekven. The additional cited reference, Kuita, does not overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Stulberger in view of Lekven, in that Kuita also fails to teach that a second format be applied to a non-telephone number. Therefore, claims 18 and 19 are also patentable.

In view of the foregoing, all of the pending claims in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact applicant's representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

PLUMSEA LAW GROUP, LLC

Dated: October 31, 2006

By:



Michael S. Lee  
Registration Number: 41,434  
Telephone number: 301-365-9040